Reply to Office action of 21 Jan 2010

REMARKS

Rejection of the claims under 35 USC §103:

Claims 19, 23, and 27-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff et al. (WO 00/75164) in view of Goldenberg et al. (U.S. Patent 5,629,184) and Pfohl et al. (U.S. Patent 4,880,497).

Claims 22 and 30-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff et al. (WO 00/75164) in view of Goldenberg et al. (U.S. Patent 5,629,184) and Pfohl et al. (U.S. Patent 4,880,497) in view of Wolff et al. (WO 00/03694).

Applicants have amended the claims to obviate the rejection. Specifically, Applicants have amended the claims to specifically recite that the amine-containing poly(vinyl ether)s have the formula:

'184 teaches only vinyl alcohol and vinyl amine containing polymers. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification as originally filed in FIG. 3. In view of the amendments, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

The Examiner's rejections are now believed to be overcome by this response to the Office Action. In view of Applicants' amendment and arguments, it is submitted that claims 19, 22, 23, and 27-32 should be allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kirk Ekena/

Kirk Ekena, Reg. No. 56,672 Roche Madison Inc. 465 Science Drive, Suite C Madison, WI 53711 608-316-3896 I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the USPTO on this date: 11 Mar. 2010 .

/Kirk Ekena/ Kirk Ekena